

## **REMARKS**

In the Official Action mailed on 7 February 2007, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-25. Claims 7-12 and 22-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims are drawn to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-6, 13-19, 20-21 and 24-25 were allowed. Claim 7 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101**


Examiner rejected claims 7-12 and 22-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims are drawn to a “program” per se as recited in each preamble and as such are drawn to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended the preamble of independent claim 7 to clarify that embodiments of the present invention are drawn to statutory subject matter.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 7 as presently amended is in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 8-12 and 22-23, which depend upon claim 7, are for the same reason in condition for allowance and for reason of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

**CONCLUSION**

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Shun Yao  
Registration No. 59,242

Date: 20 February 2007

Shun Yao  
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP  
2820 Fifth Street  
Davis, CA 95618-7759  
Tel: (530) 759-1667  
Fax: (530) 759-1665  
Email: shun@parklegal.com